

# **Citywide Public Involvement Task Force**

## **Meeting Minutes**

December 17, 2003

**Task Force member Attendance:** Amalia Alarcon-Gaddie, ONI; Bryan Aptekar, Parks; JoAnn Bowman, Bowman Consulting; Laurel Butman, OMF; Sik Yin Chan, Portland Impact; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Carlotta Collette, SEUL/Ardenwald NA; Phil Colombo, Central NE Neighbors; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Knox, BHCD; Bobby Lee, Worksystems, Inc.; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Julie Odell, Center for Public Participation; Scott Seibert, Metro CIC; Mary Volm, OMF/PDOT/Planning; Corinne Weber, SW Neighborhoods, Inc.

**Guests in Attendance:** Becky Chiao, Ombud; David Nemo, PDC; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Katy Brooks, J.D. White Co.

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved for November 19, 2003 mtg.

## **Report Format**

Laurel described who was on report writing committee. Decided to structure report so that recommendations matched with appropriate principles of public involvement. Group agrees to use format organized under principles.

Discussion brought up:

- ❑ Concern that recommendations seemed to be arbitrarily listed under different categories. Task Force still needs to prioritize during the winter.
- ❑ Concern that the categories - Culture, Community, Process, etc. – do not have an obvious link to the broad concepts developed by the workgroups in the fall – Accountability, Diversity, Communications, Process, etc. Suggestion to have explanations after each principle and sub-category.
- ❑ List page number to reference addendum where recommendation details are.
- ❑ Concern made that communications group had already prioritized. This isn't reflected in report. Brian does not recall group completing prioritization.
- ❑ Accountability workgroup wants something other than an eyeball representing their work. Suggests a microscope.
- ❑ Suggestion to change culture category to "Organizational Culture."
- ❑ Concern that Process workgroup's recommendations had a logical order or step-by-step outline that is incongruous in this report format. Brian and Julie Odell will consider solutions to tie it back together.
- ❑ Concern raised people of color membership numbers are not correct. Brian checked. Task Force does have seven people of color active in the group.
- ❑ Change reference on page for from young adults to youth.

# Consider changes, review draft outline

## Introductions:

- ❑ Under creation of task force note three commissioners support effort. Put letter from three commissioners in appendix.
- ❑ Take out emerging idea section on page 4.
- ❑ Need to confirm which commissioner will sponsor report. Francesconi started it, but Leonard is current Commissioner. Report language needs to address entire Council. Research what is sponsorship process with Auditor's Office.
- ❑ Drop "adopted city" in principles of public involvement.

## Section One: Culture – culture of listening...

- ❑ 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> proposals need wordsmithing. Suggestion take out "requirements".
- ❑ First recommendation seems to be a combination of two recommendations.

## Section One: Culture – Ongoing communication...

- ❑ Merge two recommendations addressing public involvement advisory group.
- ❑ Two recommendations address cable access TV. Consider combining.

## Section One: Culture – Transparency of governance...

- ❑ Under Transparency section, concern that 2<sup>nd</sup> recommendation about design standards. Suggestion to take out "design".
- ❑ Concern that our language refers to print media. Recognize that some people can not read.

## Section Two: Community - Diversity

- ❑ Concern that diversity recommendations should not be scattered throughout document. Others feel it's important to have them integrated in other topics.

## Section Three: Process – Capacity within City government

- ❑ 3<sup>rd</sup> recommendation does not include conflict resolution training for staff. That might be more important than customer training.
- ❑ Concern if ONI review has more information. Yes, accountability workgroup.

## Section Three: Process – Coordination and Consistency

- ❑ Recommendation on using variety of media for disseminating info needs wordsmithing. Doesn't make sense.
- ❑ Concern that the recommendation on web based database for contacts should allow decentralized staff ability to manage content. That was intent.

## Section Four: Accountability/Evaluation -

- ❑ Concern last two recommendations dealing with public financing of elections and charter review committee for form of government don't belong in report.
- ❑ Concern that we have not addressed issue of consultant contracting.

## Prioritization exercise

- Concern raised that identifying a top 5 or 10 list seems unrelated to the structure of the principles and we lose sight that we created 90 recommendations.

<b>Votes</b>	<b>Recommendation Summary</b>	<b>Section</b>
11	Initiate popular education and training on how City processes work and advocacy skills for diverse constituencies. – Diversity group	Section II – Diversity and Accessibility
10	These two were closely linked so I combined them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Develop a matrix to guide determination of types and timing of public involvement (model on Warringah matrix). – Process group</li> <li>□ Update Outreach and Involvement Handbook, including Best Practices (e.g. checklist, template for public involvement plans following Metro model, matrix, etc.) - Process group</li> </ul>	Section III – Process Early Involvement Section III – Coordination and Consistency
9	These three were linked together or closely resembled so I combined them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Adopt updated principles of Public Involvement and direct bureaus to develop written public involvement policies and written public involvement plans for certain types of projects and policies. – Accountability group</li> <li>□ Require City bureaus to develop written public involvement policies that implement the public involvement principles. – Accountability group</li> <li>□ Require bureaus to develop public involvement policies consistent with public involvement principles. – Process group</li> </ul>	Section I – Culture Culture of listening, hearing, and acting on public input  Section I – Collaborative, consensus-seeking, community-based approach
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Develop mechanism to provide early notification and public input into bureau Capital Improvement Project (CIP) discussions and bureau budgets before proposed budgets are submitted. – Process group</li> <li>□ Provide early public notification of major policy, planning and capital improvement projects (CIP) – Accountability group</li> </ul>	Section III – Process Early Involvement
8	Adequately fund and expand citizen education and training on City processes. – Education group	Section I – Transparency of Governance and Processes
7	Establish a stable funding mechanism for citywide public involvement infrastructure. – Diversity group	Section I – Culture Culture of listening, hearing, and acting on public input

<b>Votes</b>	<b>Recommendation Summary</b>	<b>Section</b>
7	Include support for and compliance with public involvement principles and requirements as an element of annual reviews for bureau directors, project managers and staff. – Accountability group.	Section IV – Accountability Evaluation Accountability
6	Expand language translation and interpretation accessibility of City information. – Diversity group	Section II – Community Inclusiveness
6	Create position of public information specialist. – Communication group	Section III – Coordination and Consistency
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Create a Public Involvement Advisory Group to act as an ongoing body to review and advocate for implementation of the Public Involvement principles and requirements for City government. – Accountability group</li> <li>□ Establish a standing City advisory committee composed of both citizens and staff to advise bureaus and hold the City accountable to citywide public involvement principles and guidelines. – Diversity group</li> </ul>	Section I – Ongoing communication and dialogue
5	Expand opportunities for engaging youth in City civic activities through community-based service learning – Education group	Section II – Community Inclusiveness
4	Review the role of ONI – Office of Neighborhood Involvement – and its location in the structure of city government. – Accountability group	Section III – Capacity within City government
4	Establish an informal networking group of public involvement staff from different bureaus to meet regularly to review and discuss public involvement policies, projects, and issues – Accountability group	Section III – Coordination and Consistency
3	Expand efforts to make all public involvement events accessible to people with disabilities, seniors, families with children and other constituency groups. - Diversity group	Section II – Community Inclusiveness
3	Initiate rewrite of Comprehensive plan Section 9: Citizen involvement to incorporate new principles and process requirements. – Accountability group	Section I – Culture Culture of listening, hearing, and acting on public input
3	Explore funding mechanisms (e.g. community grants, public budget, etc.) for dedicating funds for community-identified needs. – Process group	Section I – Collaborative, consensus- seeking, community-based approach
3	Create citywide newsletter for distribution of public information and involvement opportunities. – Communication group	Section I – Ongoing communication and dialogue
3	Provide feedback to public after project completion on how input was used, final decisions, and rationale for decision. – Accountability group	Section III – Effective and Flexible Process Design and Implementation

<b>Votes</b>	<b>Recommendation Summary</b>	<b>Section</b>
3	Better coordinate diverse stakeholder contacts and relation-building efforts with community organizations. – Communication group	Section III – Coordination and Consistency
3	Implement regular evaluation of processes by bureaus (set evaluation criteria, capture stakeholder feedback, establish base of information.) – Accountability group	Section IV – Accountability Evaluation Evaluation
2	Coordinate efforts to diversify public involvement efforts with Office of Affirmative Action’s Citywide Diversity Development Coordinating Committee. – Diversity Group	Section II – Diversity and Accessibility
2	Amend City Charter to include language describing and supporting implementation of public involvement principles and requirements. – Accountability group	Section I – Culture Culture of listening, hearing, and acting on public input
2	Develop more user friendly policies and system for providing public access to policy, planning, and capital project related documentation, and responding to public records requests. – Accountability group	Section I – Transparency of Governance and Processes
2	Create internal citywide web-based database for list management and web-based interest list sign-up for stakeholders. – Communication group	Section III – Coordination and Consistency
2	Support ongoing development of web-based calendar of public involvement events. – Communications group	Section I – Ongoing communication and dialogue
2	Review bureau compliance with public involvement principles and requirements through performance and management audits. – Accountability group	Section IV – Accountability Evaluation Evaluation
1	Create a common ordinance backing form that includes a summary of implementation and results of public involvement efforts related to subject matter in ordinance. – Accountability group.	Section III – Coordination and Consistency
1	Develop a general public involvement process “checklist” to guide bureaus through a process of evaluating the level and nature of public involvement appropriate for a particular government policy, project, or action. – Accountability group	Section III – Coordination and Consistency
1	Post Council agendas including significant public works/capital/public services/policy or planning items to web 10 days in advance of Council meetings. – Accountability group	Section I – Transparency of Governance and Processes
1	Determine a compromise on the issue of minimum notice requirements as part of the Best Practices Handbook development process. – Process group	Section III – Process Early Involvement

<b>Votes</b>	<b>Recommendation Summary</b>	<b>Section</b>
1	Better utilize existing community resources for project outreach. – diversity group	Section II – Community Inclusiveness
1	Require Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility for all City public involvement events. – Community	Section II – Diversity and Accessibility
1	Work with Purchasing Bureau and Risk Management to eliminate barriers for Minority, Women, and Emerging Small Businesses to access Professional, Technical and Expert contracts for public involvement and information services. – Diversity Group	Section II – Diversity and Accessibility
1	Develop clear policy stating customer service expectations for City employees. – Accountability group	Section I – Collaborative, consensus-seeking, community-based approach
1	Bureau directors, managers, and staff who do not comply with public involvement goals and requirements in position descriptions should face corrective action through the existing personnel system in each bureau. – Accountability group	Section IV – Accountability Evaluation Evaluation

## **Outstanding issues**

Below is a brainstorm of issues that still need to be addressed before completion and approval of the report:

- ❑ What will be adopted by ordinance and what will be resolutions, policies, etc.?
- ❑ Are these guidelines vs. standards, what is codified and what are just best practice suggestions?
- ❑ What are accountability issues of neighborhood system, business associations, other community groups, public individuals, role of ONI? Need to have joint conversation between this task force and ONI guidelines committee – GREAT.
- ❑ Neighborhood association system vs. neighbors? How do you get representative bodies? What is the communication mechanism to get to all residents in a neighborhood association? Whose responsibility is it to adequately fund a communication system that reaches all households? Neighborhood system or City bureaus? Can they work together?
- ❑ Have not considered how the business association system fits in?
- ❑ Issue from ONI guidelines committee – GREAT – regarding notification period before final action by city agencies - 30 days vs. 45 days? Currently City code chapter 3.96 has a 30-day notification period.